

App'n. No.: 09/740,382  
Amendment Dated September 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 8, 2004

MATP-593US

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 2 is canceled. Claim 1 is amended to include limitations from claims 2 and to add the limitation that the channel matrix includes entries for both available and unavailable channels; claim 11 is amended to include limitations from claims 12. Claim 12 is amended to be consistent with claim 11. Claims 16 and 17 are amended to include limitations similar to the limitations in amended claims 1 and 11. Basis for these amendments may be found in claims 2 and 12 and in the specification at page 8, lines 13-27.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 11, 16 and 17. The amendment to claim 1 adds the elements of claim 2 and requires that the channel matrix include entries for both available and unavailable channels. In particular, neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III nor their combination disclose or suggest an  $n \times m$  channel matrix where the channel group selector displays a channel indicator of a base channel in the current group of channels or a channel matrix which includes entries for both available and unavailable channels. With these amendments, claim 1 is no longer subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III.

Agasse concerns a navigation system for a multi channel digital television system. The invention described in Agasse includes a  $n \times m$  channel matrix (or grille) and a display bar 84 displaying the title of the program currently being shown. (Figure 8B and page 21, lines 7-9). The Grille of the Agasse application does not include entries for both available and unavailable channels (for example, unavailable channels 6 and 8 in Fig. 8A) nor does it include a channel group selector that switches the grille among multiple groups of channels or a channel indicator of a base channel of a current group of channels.

Oosterhout et al. concerns a method of navigating through television programs. Oosterhout et al. disclose displaying a mosaic of sub-images on a display screen. As shown in Figs. 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7, all entries in the matrix include sub images and, thus, represent available channels. Oosterhout et al. do not disclose or suggest displaying a matrix that includes entries for both available and unavailable channels.

Appln. No.: 09/740,382  
Amendment Dated September 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 8, 2004

MATP-593US

Matthews, III concerns a program identification system provided to inform a user of an interactive viewing system of the identity of a program being viewed. Matthews, III does not include a channel matrix of any kind. Thus, it does not disclose or suggest an  $n \times m$  channel matrix where the channel group selector displays a channel indicator of a base channel in the current group of channels or a channel matrix which includes entries for both available and unavailable channels.

Claims 11, 16 and 17 include similar amendments and, thus, are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III et al. Claims 3-4, 6-9, 18 and 19 depend from claim 1, claims 12-14 depends from claim 11. Accordingly, these claims are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III for at least the same reasons as their base claims.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III and Schein et al. The ground for rejection is overcome by the amendment to claim 1 described above.

The Schein et al. application concerns a method and apparatus for searching a guide using program characteristics. Schein et al. do not disclose or suggest displaying an  $n \times m$  channel matrix and, so, can not disclose or suggest the material that is missing from Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III.

In particular, neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III, Schein et al. nor their combination disclose or suggest an  $n \times m$  channel matrix where the channel group selector displays a channel indicator of a base channel in the current group of channels or a channel matrix which includes entries for both available and unavailable channels. Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Because neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III, Schein et al. nor their combination disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, claim 5 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III and Schein et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III and Handelman.

Appln. No.: 09/740,382  
Amendment Dated September 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 8, 2004

MATP-593US

The Handelman application concerns a voice activated communications system and program guide. Handelman does not disclose or suggest displaying a channel matrix a plurality of program indicators and, so, can not disclose or suggest the material that is missing from Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III.

In particular, neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III, Handelman nor their combination disclose or suggest an  $n \times m$  channel matrix where the channel group selector displays a channel indicator of a base channel in the current group of channels or a channel matrix which includes entries for both available and unavailable channels. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Because neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III, Handelman nor their combination disclose or suggest the limitation of claim 1, claim 10 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III and Handelman for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III and Legall et al. The ground for rejection is overcome by the amendment to claim 11 described above.

The Legall et al. application concerns an integrated search of an electronic program guide, internet and other information resources. Legall et al. do not disclose or suggest displaying a channel matrix including a plurality of program indicators and, so, can not disclose or suggest the material that is missing from Agasse, Oosterhout et al. and Matthews, III.

In particular, neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III, Legall et al. nor their combination disclose or suggest an  $n \times m$  channel matrix where the channel group selector displays a channel indicator of a base channel in the current group of channels or a channel matrix which includes entries for both available and unavailable channels. Claim 15 depends from claim 11. Because neither Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III, Legall et al. nor their combination disclose or suggest the limitation of claim 11, claim 15 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Agasse, Oosterhout et al., Matthews, III and Legall et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

Appln. No.: 09/740,382  
Amendment Dated September 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 8, 2004

MATP-593US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-19.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549  
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/tmb


Dated: September 30, 2004

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via Facsimile Transmission to Facsimile No. 1-703-872-9306 addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

September 30, 2004



Tonya M. Berger

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**